

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed June 10, 2009, the Examiner has required restriction between the following groups of invention:

Group I: Claims 1-71 and 87-88, drawn to an element having an adhesive on its surface; and

Group II: Claims 72-86, drawn to a method of manufacturing a glue-coated element, which is prepared to glue together with another identically glue-coated element.

Applicants hereby elects the invention of Group I, claims 1-71 and 87-88 for the purposes of examination. This election is made with traverse.

A review of the claims in the above-referenced application shows that claim 31 is directed to an element having a surface on which a one-component adhesive is applied at least on a section thereof, the moisture content of which is reduced after application up to the point of moisture content equilibrium. Independent claim 72 is directed to a method of manufacturing a glue-coated element which comprises the steps of applying a one-component adhesive to at least one surface section of the element and reducing the moisture content of the applied one-component adhesive up to the point of moisture content equilibrium. Thus, the method as claimed can only be used to produce the claimed article. Contrary to the Examiner's position, it is submitted that the inventions listed in Groups I and II, as set forth in the claims, relate to a single general inventive concept and have the same and corresponding special technical features as set forth in claims 31 and 72. The fact that the glue-coated element manufactured by the method can be glued to another identical glue-coated element is irrelevant to the issue. The inventive concept has to do with the application of a one-component adhesive whose moisture content is reduced after application up to the point of moisture content equilibrium.

For these reasons, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn and all claims in the case should be acted upon. Further, in order to do a complete search for the article, the Examiner must necessarily search the methods for producing such an article. Thus, it puts no hardship on the Examiner to examine all claims.

An early action on the merits is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe an amendment is needed to place this case in condition for allowance, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed to be due as a result of this response.

Should the Director determine that a fee is due, he is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Braun et al.

By Barry L. Kelmachter #29999/

Barry L. Kelmachter

BACHMAN & LaPOINTE, P.C.

Reg. No. 29,999

Attorney for Applicants

Telephone:(203)777-6628 ext. 112

Telefax: (203)865-0297

Email: docket@bachlap.com

Date: July 10, 2009